

when 46 percent of the Members of Congress were simply left out of the process between the Republican Governors and the Republican majority?

In that article in the Washington Post, Mr. Speaker, Vermont Governor Dean describes the situation very clearly. He states the agreement is only a deal between the Republicans. Political partisanship must not take precedent over the lives for seniors or, for that matter, children or mothers.

Allow me to remind my colleagues that school breakfast and lunch programs are not included in the rumors that were talked about, removing senior citizens food programs. Thousands of school children are still under this budget ax when school nutrition programs are subject to a 30-percent cut through this personal responsibility, and tonight we still do not know if our senior citizen nutrition programs are exempt.

Congress should end the welfare as it is currently operating, but the Personal Responsibility Act should not include nutrition programs, whether they be for our seniors or for our youngest children in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DURBIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I declare my strong opposition to H.R. 728.

This Republican proposal effectively dismantles the highly successful COPS program and the innovative prevention programs that have been praised by law enforcement agencies throughout the country.

The misguided block grant funding called for in H.R. 728 repeats the mistakes of history by returning to the ineffective use of block grants that were the subject of major abuse and scandal in our recent past.

Let us not forget the shameful instances of taxpayer money used to buy private cars, airplanes, and even an armored tank under the former block grant program L.E.A.A.

H.R. 728 opens the door once again for abuse, while doing nothing to guarantee enhanced public safety. It does not guarantee one single new police officer on our streets or the implementation of one additional prevention program.

I am particularly concerned that under H.R. 728 communities will lose \$2.5 billion that would have put more community police officers on the street and would have provided for the additional implementation of crucial prevention programs.

It is significant that the National Association of Counties, whose members would receive the grants, opposes H.R. 728 and supports the President's 1994 crime bill with a balanced approach of funding for both law enforcement and prevention programs.

Those who argue that prevention programs are useless fail to understand the complex causes of crime. They fail to understand that in communities across our Nation, criminal activity occurs primarily where opportunity and hope do not exist.

Supporters of H.R. 728 argue that the prevention programs it repeals are useless fluff and a waste of public funds. They are dead wrong.

In the 1980's communities in my district received Federal and State funds specifically for crime prevention efforts aimed at reducing heavy gang activity.

Programs were initiated to provide at-risk youths with positive alternatives to gangs.

For students, after-school programs including sports, study skill clinics, and mentoring were offered.

For those out of school with no job prospects and clearly the most vulnerable to violent gang participation; programs were offered in basic education, job skills, and self esteem.

These programs not only helped lower crime, but nearly eliminated gang activity in the east Los Angeles community.

Ironically, when the gang activity dropped to such a low level the funds for prevention programs were misguidedly shifted to a different community.

Almost instantaneously, gang violence increased dramatically and has been rising steadily ever since.

Prevention programs work. They work because they give alternatives to individuals who have few options and they work because they give hope to individuals who have none.

If we are to win our struggle against violence and crime in our country, we must have more police on our streets and effective programs that give positive alternatives to crime and provide individuals with hope and opportunity for a better life.

The Republican leadership calls H.R. 728 the taking back our streets act. What this bill takes back, however, is not our streets, but our chance to create safe streets all across America.

Police, parents, and public officials nationwide have proven that community policing and prevention programs are our best hope for eliminating crime in our country.

To make this hope a reality, we must oppose H.R. 728.

COMMUNITY POLICING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] is recognized

for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the issue that we are dealing with in the Congress this week and early into next week, the issue of the crime bill.

Just last September President Clinton signed the most comprehensive, effective, tough crime bill in the history of this country. It was a crime bill that was tough on repeat offenders. It was a crime bill that made a significant contribution to building more prisons across this country, \$10 billion. It was also a bill that put 100,000 new police officers on the streets of America.

But I want to talk about two parts of that bill because two important sections of that bill are in serious jeopardy over the next several days in the Congress of the United States; that is, sections of the bill that require and fund 100,000 new police officers across America, partially funded by the Federal Government, community policing.

Let me just say that as a former first assistant district attorney in Middlesex County, one of the largest counties in the country, and having had the experience of overseeing a caseload of over 13,000 criminal cases a year, and having had the experience of working with 54 cities and towns and 54 different police departments across that Middlesex County, I can tell you that community policing is a cutting edge of what works in law enforcement. It is not an accident that we have for the time an Attorney General with vast experience in the front lines of the fight against crime.

This attorney general knows what it is about to manage a case load, knows what it is about to work with police departments, and knows what fighting crime in tough areas is all about. And that is why I believe we have seen this smart, tough, effective crime bill passed into law.

□ 1950

Community policing has worked all over America, and I want to talk for a minute about my hometown, the city of Lowell, MA, where 13 additional police officers and a commitment made by the Federal Government, and a commitment, by the way, made by the Republican Governor of Massachusetts, Governor Weld, a former prosecutor who also understands that community policing works.

Because of that commitment, the city of Lowell has been able to form community partnerships using the Community Policing Program. Community partnerships are the hallmark of police and community oriented proposals. During the last year the Lowell Police Department under the leadership of Police Chief Educate Davis has opened up new community policing precincts in different sections of the city of Lowell, Lower Belvidere, Back Central Street, Lower Highlands. They have established a Team Lowell to go

out in the communities and fight crime. They have developed a van plan, getting contributions from toll booths all over the city, to help form their partnership between the school department and the police department. They have a community response team with inspection services. During the first year they have been able to close down more than 150 buildings which are identified as drug houses or identified as structures that were not rehabilitatable.

With the special units, the community response team has been responsible for over 350 arrests. We have had school visits by precinct officers into the community, visiting the schools, forming partnerships with educators and students and guidance counselors. We have established flag football leagues, where police officers donate their time, working with youths in the community. They also have a street worker program basketball league working in the city of Lowell, again forming that partnership, and a DARE summer camp has also provided leadership in the area of cutting drug use among youths.

Just this past week the police chief in Lowell came out with a report showing the city of Lowell crime trends as a result of community policing in that city. The results are very, very important.

These results show how community policing has actually worked in one particular city, Lowell, MA. These results are not the results of a political opinion poll. They are not the results of focus groups. They are not the results of putting one's finger into the political wind to determine what is popular one week or another. Because as I watched the Republican rhetoric coming on the other side of this issue, I see a lack of real understanding of what makes law enforcement ticks, about what works in law enforcement. But I see a lot of good political posturing.

What really concerns me is I see a feeling that many Republicans on the other side of the aisle who supported this crime bill 4 months ago, 5 months ago, supported it on the floor of the House, now are coming in with a new proposal that would not guarantee one community police officer. They allow communities all kinds of discretion to determine whether they want to purchase fax machines, limousines, new police vehicles, with no requirements at all that they engage in a community policing program that has worked.

What seems to be ignored is the fact that these statistics show that community policing works. And there is nothing that could be more dangerous than for us to back out of our commitments that we have made to communities all over America to participate in a 3-year plan to fund community police departments across this country.

But that is what is at risk. And I think it is really unfortunate as a person who has had some experience with

crime to watch the rhetoric in the Congress. Many Members of Congress who have a lot to say on quick sound bites about crime have never been in a courtroom, have never prosecuted a case, have never put one criminal in jail, ever. But they have become so-called experts in law enforcement, so-called experts in what the future trends are in this country and what works and what does not. And that is bad news for America, because fighting crime is serious business. You do not learn how to fight crime by reading a political poll or looking at a focus group or determining shifts in the political winds. Fighting crime is serious business.

Mr. STUPAK. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I would be glad to yield to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], who I might add has done tremendous work on the task force on crime and has 12 years experience as a police officer in Michigan. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman. I thank the gentleman for once again taking the lead in putting together another special order on crime. But you were commenting a little bit there on statistics in Lowell, MA and what you found with community policing. But through all this rhetoric, I think one part that has been lost is that if you take the last decade, take the last 10 years, crime has tripled. It has gone up, violent crime, part I crime, has tripled in this country. It has gone up 300 percent.

In that same 10-year period, do you realize how many police officers were added to help combat crime, which went up 300 percent in 10 years? A mere 10-percent increase in police officers throughout this country.

So the point that you are making about violent crime and how police officers under a community policing program can have impact, our resources are scarce, crime is soaring out of sight. Like I said, it tripled in the last decade. Yet here we have a program that works, that works, as is shown in your area, and I am from northern Michigan, in Marquette, a city in my State of 17,000 people. But yet we put a community police officer in 1990, and in the last 2 years the crime has dropped 23 percent. The first 2 years it has been in existence it dropped 23 percent.

We were just awarded another police officer because the community policing grant ran out in Marquette, but under the COPS Fast Program which was announced yesterday, they have now received money to fund this program for another 3 years to keep the solid work that is being done in community policing in a small rural community like Marquette. It works.

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you. The 23 percent figure that you mentioned is consistent with the figures here that are up in the first year of community policing in the city of Lowell. For ex-

ample, burglaries, down 34 percent; residential burglaries, down 32 percent; business burglaries, and what could be more important in terms of fostering economic development and business growth, down 41 percent; larcenies, down 23 percent. In car thefts in the city of Lowell, they are down 20 percent as a result of community policing. And these are not my figures. They do not come from a political pollster. They do not come from a political group in Washington. They come from the police chief of city of Lowell, MA, a law enforcement professional with years of experience in fighting crime, in a very, very difficult city to fight crime.

When I was a first assistant district attorney in Middlesex County, the first five homicides I attend, and we used to in our office, the first assistant would have to go to a homicide scene to determine what experts needed to come in to investigate a murder, to basically head up that investigation and make sure it was conducted properly.

The first five homicides that I attended in the first few months, three of them were in Lowell, MA. So this is an area really that has been plagued by difficulties in fighting crime. And the statistics that you mentioned are consistent right in this community, dramatic increases in crime in the eighties and into the early nineties.

These figures I think speak for themselves, and they are consistent with my colleagues' experiences as well.

The other thing that I think is important to mention is what community policing is all about. Because sometimes people hear the term and really do not understand what makes community policing work and what actually happens when a community undertakes a competent community policing program.

I know from the rhetoric I have heard on the floor of the House of Representatives, it appears to me a lot of Members of Congress do not know what community policing is all about. I was wondering if you could, given your 12 years of experience, relate what community experience is all about and your experience with it.

□ 2000

Mr. STUPAK. I would be pleased to. Back before I came to Congress, I was in the State legislature back in 1989 and 1990. We wrote the community policing law for Michigan. Community policing is really a concept where the police officer works and lives in the community in which he is policing.

It is usually a small geographic area where the police officer basically befriends the people in which he is serving. Many people refer to community policing probably in the larger cities as walking the beat. While you are walking that beat, you are learning to communicate with the people you are serving. You have built a friendship. You have built a trust. You actually have

built a partnership in the community in which you are trying to serve.

Once that partnership is cemented, then the faith, the trust and the confidence in law enforcement comes back. So when there is a crime, when you go to one of the five murders that you went to in Lowell, MA, when you go there, you go there a complete stranger and you try to do an investigation. But if you are a community police officer and a murder or a crime happens in that community, you go there, you have contact. You have seen these people. You are not strangers trying to resolve a heinous crime that may have concern, but rather, you are a community that has come together to focus on this crime, with the faith, confidence, and trust in your police. They are more open. They will assist him in solving this crime.

And once you have built that trust, that relationship, community policing can and will work. You work together as a community. It is a partnership that is formed between the geographic area.

In Michigan, one of the ways we defined the areas in which a community police officer would work would be the density of population in a given area, the crime rate and the juvenile population, since juveniles seem to be the focus of most, a lot of the crime that happens nowadays.

So when you take those three factors, you put a police officer in there. That police officer lives there. He works there. So when that police officer investigates this crime, whatever it might be, whether it is murder in Lowell, MA, or breaking and entering in northern Michigan, the police officer that took the original complaint, started the investigation, is the same police officer that stays through the whole investigation. It is the same police officer that brings the request to the district attorney or the prosecutor for the warrant. It is the same police officer that goes to court with the witnesses or the victim's family, whatever it might be.

Throughout this whole investigation, there is a trust that is being built. There is confidence in the department. Because the way it is right now, without community policing, one police officer takes the initial report. He turns it over to the investigator who goes and sees the family or victim, wherever he does his investigation. Someone else goes to the prosecutor to get the warrant. And when you go to the day of trial, the person who took the initial complaint, you do not remember anymore. You might know the investigator. You never met the prosecutor. There is not that teamwork, that partnership, that relationship, that trust that is needed.

When it is put together, it works, whether it is a rural area or in an urban area.

I know the gentlewoman from Houston, TX [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] wants to

jump in here because they have a tremendous community policing program.

Mr. MEEHAN. I might add, our colleague from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] has been a leader in the Committee on the Judiciary on these issues, has been extremely active and has experience as a Houston city council member, a lawyer, and I have to say has been a very articulate, outspoken advocate on these crime prevention programs, antigang activities. And I am delighted that she could join us tonight because she certainly has made a tremendous impression as a new Member of Congress. And I wonder if she could relate some of the experiences that she has had in Houston.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership and certainly I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] for really evidencing from a very personal perspective, and as you have evidenced from a very personal perspective what it means to be a police officer and what it means to balance the whole concept of prevention and preventing in law enforcement.

I think one of the things that our colleagues are missing on the other side of the aisle is there is not a conflict with law enforcement and having officers know their communities. You are not inhibited or prevented from being forceful in arresting the bad guy, if you will, and ensuring safety in the streets, if you also have the balance of being able to know the neighborhood.

Coming from the city of Houston and having served, and I thank the gentleman very much, on the city council, being part of the local community, one of the aspects of policing that they were so excited about is what we called neighborhood storefronts. That simply meant that our officers were right in the neighborhood. And believe it or not, we would have a tough time turning away communities who wanted to offer free space so that cops could be on the beat, somewhat similar to the President's programs of cops fast, cops ahead, and cops more.

What it meant is that they would come into the neighborhood, they would be next to the corner ice cream store, the corner grocery store, the neighbor who was going to the cleaner's could go into this neighborhood storefront, share information. The police could share information and there was a complete dialoging. You would be very much pleased with the fact, evidenced in your support for this program and our support for his program, of how many criminal activities were either stopped or how many arrests were made because of that neighborhood influence and because of that interaction between neighbor and police.

I think it is certainly a travesty that we would come this far, hearing the announcement that was just made for this past week where the President was

able to announce some 6,600 law enforcement agencies being able to hire 7,110 community police officers under the Cops Fast Program. It is a tragedy to know that what we have on the table now is an effort to go back to the station, if you will. When I say the station, the train station, rather than pulling out and going forward, we are going back to where we started from and to turn back the clock on programs like this.

Mr. MEEHAN. The point that the gentlewoman made relative to getting police officers into the community is important for two respects. One is, you can reduce crime. But my experience has been, we have a DA up in Middlesex County, Tom Riley, who has really been on the cutting edge of priority prosecution programs. And what happens is, a police officer working with the community, the schools, the probation department, they can identify who the worst offenders are, who the gang leaders are, who the ringleaders are, identify them and make them a priority and get them out of that neighborhood. Those who cannot be rehabilitated or those who need to be removed are removed. And you get them out of the neighborhood and then you work with the vast majority of the individuals that are left. That is the type of law enforcement that works. And it is proven all over the country.

Mr. STUPAK. For those who are watching us either in their office or at home, the reason why we are here, this program, community policing, was just started October 1, just over 4 months ago. And on February 7, the Republicans, our friends on the other side of the aisle, brought forth six pieces of crime legislation on February 7. We have been debating it for the last few days. We talk about 100,000 police officers we made a commitment to put on America's streets in the next 5 years. The program is 4 months old. There is overwhelming support throughout this Nation for it from the police officers.

The gentlewoman from Texas mentioned the Cops on the Beat Program, the Cops More Program, the Cops Fast Program, three of the programs that have just started will have 17,000 police officers on the street in the last 4 months.

But why are we here talking about it? Because even though the slogan is, our friends on the other side of the aisle say the slogan is taking back the streets, what they are doing is giving back the streets to the criminals, to the violent perpetrators because they want to scrap this program, this 100,000 cops on the street. I still have not heard a good reason why it should be scrapped, but they want to scrap it for nothing more than political reasons.

The would replace these 100,000 cops on the street and replace them with a massive block grant program. When you look at that massive block grant program, billions of dollars are going to be put into a block grant program. They way that is to help fight crime at

the local level; after all, the local people know what is best for them. There is not one police officer earmarked in their plan. There is not any program earmarked in their plan to put police officers on the street. And we have been seen in late 1968, with the Law Enforcement and Administration Agency, LEAA, how the money was squandered, was squandered or as someone said the other day, it reminds you of the pork of Christmas past, what they did with all that money. For every dollar that was spent in the late 1960's and early 1970's, 33 cents on every dollar went for administrative costs, overhead, bureaucrats. We did not see more police officers on the street.

What we are here trying to inform the American people is this unrestrained giving of money back without any conditions will repeat the problems we had in the late 1960's and the early 1970's, the abuses that went into the LEAA Program.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Let me just take you up on that point because you make a very valuable point. First of all, I think it is important to note that we come from respectively different parts of the Nation. I think it is a tragedy, again, if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would pretend to think that this is a big-city problem or it is a big-State problem. What we are finding out is whatever the jurisdiction, the hamlet, a town, a country, the cops program that was passed in the 1994 omnibus crime bill went to seed—that's the heart of the matter.

□ 2010

It went into the places where maybe they had one officer in the town. In the city of Houston, obviously, we are constantly looking to find ways to improve the number of police-to-citizen relationship, to develop the relationship, but also to provide the protection. We needed as much as a smaller city in the State of Texas, or a county, or a hamlet, or a town, than may be in your fair State of Massachusetts.

The issue becomes how do you relate law enforcement to the 21st century; how do you prevent gang violence. What you do, as has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], is you get those officers who are in plain clothes, who are in the neighborhoods, who are in the schools, to now who the characters are, if you will.

At the same time, and I appreciate the gentleman's response, having served as a police officer for a number of years, you even get those local police officers to participate in Boys Club and Girls Club, and the Boy Scouts.

I have an urban Scouting program, for example, in the city of Houston. Many police officers are involved in that. There is PAL. When you have the officers in the neighborhood, they are able to go into the schools and go beyond the call of city, to a certain extent, and even begin to look these

youngsters in the eye and say, "That is not the gang you want to be in," of either gain their confidence and get information that truly helped to, if you will, break the crime cycle.

I think that is very important. This is not an issue that is an issue for large cities, large States, it is an issue of crime prevention for this particular Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the gentleman's response about police involvement in those kinds of activities.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly very helpful, because it humanizes police officers. It is not just whether it is a police athletic league or teaching about DARE, DARE to keep the kids off drugs, a program that was developed in L.A., and it is taught nationwide, or whether it is seeing the police officer in the school.

When you put a human being—and it goes back to the community policing concept of building trust, confidence, and respect for law enforcement.

What are we doing here, as we were talking earlier tonight? In the bills that are pending before this floor right now, the Republican crime bill of taking back the streets, there is not one program earmarked to humanize the police, to even provide us one police. Instead, they want this massive block grant program.

What happened when we had it back in 1968? Did they form PAL? Did they put police officers in the schools? Here is an example of some of the things they did. The local people said, "We know what is best. Let us do it. We can do it better. We know what works in Houston, Marquette, Michigan, or Lowell MA."

Here is what they did. In 1968 a sheriff in Louisiana purchased a tank—a tank to combat crime. In another State, they used \$84,000 to buy an airplane—an airplane. The only value they got out of the airplane, other than to buzz the Governor around the State, was it had a very secret mission.

That airplane came to Washington, DC, picked up some Moon rocks, and went back to the State from whence it had come. That was the only law enforcement function of that airplane you could consider, because that must have been top security, picking up some Moon rocks, but \$84,000 went there.

Or how about one of the Southern States, which started a cadet program, a law enforcement cadet program to help out young people, as the gentleman suggests? Do you know what the cadet program was? Some \$117,000 was spent for that sheriff's family members and friends of his to have a job at the expense of taxpayers.

Or another city, they used \$200,000 in LEAA grants to buy property—to buy property. Another city used money to buy an unmarked car, so the mayor could drive around. This is the same type of program that they are telling us: "Take about \$10 billion, we will give it to the local communities. They

know what is best in fighting crime." Not one police officer.

Thirty-three percent, we have seen, back from the 1968 and seventies program, went to administrative costs, and what for? We did this before, for all of us who were here, but it happened before in 1968 and what was it used for? Tanks, airplanes, limousines, land. It goes on and on and on.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. I would like to point out, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], had talked about gang violence and what the difference is when the community police officers get into that community and learn that community.

When I was assistant district attorney in Middlesex County I got a call one afternoon. It was about 2:15 one afternoon, and the State Police informed me that a 15-year-old boy from Lowell, MA, had been shot in the head, a culmination of what was gang activity in the city of Lowell during that time period.

We had had an influx of Asian immigrants into the city, many of whom had been victims of crime, Asian crime on Asian crime, where the people, immigrants from other cultures who came from a culture where they did not necessarily trust authority and did not know what the role of the police department was, whose side the police department was really on.

It was very difficult for us in the DA's office to get witnesses of crime to participate and to tell us what happened in a crime, because they did not know whether to trust us or whether to trust the police, so they did not trust anyone.

In this murder of a 15-year-old boy, it was the culmination of months of gang activity in the city. People were keeping their sons and daughters home from Lowell high school.

We sent a district attorney up to the scene of that. The DA, Tom Reilly, who is a very innovative and hardworking DA, went up to the city. We instituted a priority prosecution program there.

We brought in people from the Asian community to the table of the mayor's office; we brought in the probation department that had the probation records of all the individuals involved. We brought in the school department, which could give us a perspective of who attended school, who did not, who the bad actors were, who the people were who were trying to get headed in the right direction.

We brought the police department to the table. We also brought the DA's office to the table, and the DA met on this task force every single week, every week. We identified over a period of time the 25 ring leaders of these gangs, the individuals who could not be rehabilitated, who had long criminal records, who the school department agreed, the probation department